



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/501,101

07/07/2004

Manfred Angermayr

2001P14008WOUS

5587

29177 7590 10/24/2008
BELL, BOYD & LLOYD, LLP
P.O. BOX 1135
CHICAGO, IL 60690

EXAMINER

CHRISS, ANDREW W

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2419

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

10/24/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/501,101	Applicant(s) ANGERMAYR ET AL.	
	Examiner Andrew Chriss	Art Unit 2419	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 July 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 21-40 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 21-40 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 07 July 2007 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Pre-Brief Conference Request

1. Applicant's amendment, filed May 27, 2008, has been entered and carefully considered. Claims 21, 29, and 30 are currently amended, Claims 1-20 are canceled, and Claims 21-40 are currently pending.
2. Applicant's arguments, filed in the pre-appeal conference request on July 24, 2008 are considered persuasive. The previous rejections of Claims 21-24, 28, and 29 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) and Claims 25-27, and 30-40 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are withdrawn. However, the invention as currently claimed is unpatentable for reasons herein below.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

4. **Claims 21-40** rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention. The claim limitations "at least two internal logical networks are set up in the network node" (Claim 21), "setting up two internal logical networks" (Claim 31), and "both network nodes have the same signaling point code" in Claims 21 and 31 is not enabled based on the claim language and corresponding disclosure. Applicant admits that "every signaling point, e.g., an exchange (node), is *uniquely* identified in

Art Unit: 2419

the network by a signaling point code (Applicant's specification, paragraph 0004) and that "(i)n Signaling System No. 7, each signaling point is *uniquely* identified by signaling point code" (Applicant's specification, paragraph 0018) (emphasis added). Therefore, each signaling point must have a different point code. Claims 21 and 31 further describe setting up "at least two internal logical networks in the network node" in order to share the same signaling point code between multiple network nodes. Paragraph 0027 of Applicant's specification describes setting up internal logical networks:

"two internal logical networks N1 and N2 are set up in the exchange B-Vst. All signaling paths of the exchange A-Vst to the nodes in the signaling network are initially assigned to the network N1. In addition, a signaling path S1 is set up between the exchange A-Vst and the network N2 of the exchange B-Vst, so that the exchange A-Vst has continued access to the signaling network."

Paragraph 0044 further describes internal logical networks:

"Twenty internal logical networks N1 . . . N20 are set up in the exchange B-Vst, wherein the networks N1 . . . N20 are assigned to each other in pairs N1-N20, N2-N19, etc. This assignment can be represented in the exchange B-Vst in the form of a table T, for example. The operations when transmitting data in each network pair N1-N20, N2-N19, etc. are analogous to those described in FIGS. 1 and 2. I.e. the messages from an exchange (not shown) which arrive in the network N3 are forwarded to the network N18 by means of the table T, without an error message, if the addresses of the messages are not known to the network N2. The message is sent from the network N18 to the exchange

Art Unit: 2419

(not shown) which is coupled to the network N18. In the opposite direction, messages arriving in the network N18 are forwarded to the network N3 by means of the table T.”

Based on the portions of Applicant’s disclosure cited above, it is unclear as to what the broad terminology of “internal logical network” comprises. Applicant's specification fails to disclose how an internal logical network would be functionally set up or a configuration of a network node to enable multiple internal logical networks. Therefore, based on the state of prior art, as described with regards to Applicant's admission above, and the lack of direction provided by the inventor, the subject matter in independent claims 21 and 31 is not enabled and would require undue experimentation by one of ordinary skill in the art to make and use the invention. Claims 22-30 and 32-40 depend on Claims 21 and 31, and fail to resolve the deficiencies therein.

5. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

6. **Claims 21-40** rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. **Regarding Claims 21 and 31**, claim language “internal logical network” is indefinite as to what the term comprises. Claims 22-30 and 32-40 depend on Claims 21 and 31 and fail to resolve the deficiencies therein. **Further regarding Claim 30**, claim language "at least one of a mathematical algorithm to the second internal logical network and the third internal logical network for forwarding" is unclear as to what is being alternatively claimed.

Conclusion

Art Unit: 2419

7. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

- a. Segal (United States Patent 5,680,437) discloses a distributed SS7 call processor wherein multiple digital channel interfaces share a common signaling point code.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Andrew Chriss whose telephone number is (571)272-1774. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday, 7:30 AM - 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Hassan Kizou can be reached on 571-272-3088. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Andrew Chriss
Examiner
Art Unit 2419
10/17/2008

/Hassan Kizou/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2419